

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed April 23, 2008, claims 1-7 were rejected. In response, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the below-provided remarks.

For reference, claims 1 and 2 are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added. The amendments to claims 1 and 2 clarify the subject matter recited in the claims and are supported by the subject matter described at page 4, lines 8-14, page 10, lines 23 and 24, and page 11, lines 11 and 12 of the specification.

Objections to the Drawings

The current application is a U.S. National Stage application. The drawing requirements for U.S. National Stage applications are identified in MPEP 1825 and labeling of figures as "Prior Art" is not required (see PCT Rule 11.11). Further, MPEP 1893.03(f) states that "[t]he USPTO may not impose requirements beyond those imposed by the Patent Cooperation Treaty (e.g., PCT Rule 11)." In view of the above, Applicants respectfully assert that labeling Figures 1-3 and 5a as "Prior Art" is not required in the current application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, claim 1 was rejected because it failed to recite structure to carry out the "calculating" of lines 2-4. Claim 1 was also rejected for lack of antecedent basis. Similarly, claim 2 was rejected for lack of antecedent basis. No separate reasons were provided to support the rejections of claims 3-7.

In regard to the rejection of claim 1, Applicants submit that claim 1 is amended to recite structure for the "calculating" operations. Claim 1 is also amended to use proper antecedent basis. Claim 2 is also amended to provide proper antecedent basis.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(a)

Claims 1 and 3-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicants' own admission. However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites "a first odd filtering module . . . and a second odd filtering module" which filter the last 1, 2, and 3 odd transformed data items having the highest frequencies in the set of transformed data. Claim 1 also recites the second filtering module is connected to the first filtering module.

In contrast, Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 3 of the present application, and the accompanying description, does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim. Even if Figure 3 were considered prior art, as asserted in the Office Action, Figure 3 merely shows adders, multipliers, and rotators which supply filtered data $wf(0)$ to $wf(7)$, generally. Figure 3 does not specifically disclose odd filtering modules to filter specific odd transformed data items having the highest frequencies in the set of transformed data. Figure 3 also does not specifically disclose a second odd filtering module connected to a first odd filtering module, as recited in the claim. Moreover, the Office Action does not attempt to show how the illustration of Figure 3 or the accompanying description of Figure 3 might describe the recited filtering modules, specifically. Therefore, the general description of filtering using the arrangement of Figure 3 does not disclose first and second odd filtering modules, as specifically recited in the claim.

For the reasons presented above, Figure 3 does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim because Figure 3 and the accompanying description do not specifically disclose first and second odd filtering modules. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert claim 1 is patentable over the asserted reference because Figure 3 does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim.

Dependent Claims 2-7

Claims 2-7 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert claims 2-7 are allowable based on an allowable base claim. Additionally, each of claims 2-7 may be allowable for further reasons, as described below.

In regard to claim 2, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 is patentable over Figure 3 because Figure 3 does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 2. Claim 2 recites an “even filtering module” which filters the last even or the last 2 even transformed data items having the highest frequencies in the set of transformed data. In contrast, even if Figure 3 were prior art as asserted in the Office Action, Figure 3 merely shows adders, multipliers, and rotators which supply filtered data $wf(0)$ to $wf(7)$, generally. Figure 3 does not disclose a specific even filtering module to filter a specific last even or a last 2 even transformed data items having the highest frequencies in the set of transformed data. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 2 is patentable over the asserted reference because Figure 3 does not disclose an even filtering module which filters specific even transformed data items having the highest frequencies in the set of transformed data, as recited in claim 2.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendment and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: July 23, 2008

Mark A. Wilson

Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111